In Guatemala We (Not Castro) Trained the Rebels, P. 3

Reported Adoption of 'First Strike' Strategy Questioned by Senator Clark at Swarthmore Arms Parley, P. 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 8 FEBRUARY 26, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Triumph of Youth, Not of Electronic Hardware

When Col. Glenn finally went into orbit, it was a feat of mechanical technology, a stunt in a competition for world prestige; no new dimensions were added to the human spirit, the only new dimension promised was for the game—and curse—of war, which moves toward outer space; Gagarin, Titov and Glenn are triumphs neither of socialism nor democracy, but of the same machine type civilization; both sides manage to organize their energies best when the challenge is linked to wreaking murder, out of self defense and for the highest motives of course, upon the other. The man in the sky is still the man in the cave.*

In the four thousand students who came to Washington last week-end we salute a different youth, achieving a different and more difficult orbit. After the dreary McCarthy years, in which fear of non-conformity lay like a pall on the campus, this marked the launching within *Turn Toward Peace* of a new student movement. No lucrative industry, like that of aerospace, stood by to focus all its public relations apparatus on this feat; no powerful bureaucracy, like that of the Pentagon, provided them with million dollar vehicles in which to set out; as they boarded buses for Washington, no corps of scientists stood by to measure the slightest reactions of heart and spleen to the gravitational pulls of indifference, hostility, suspicion and apathy. They made it on their own.

A Plea in Pantomime

Friday, when the first students began to arrive, was a miserable day of sleet and fog. By noon of Saturday, when the sun came out like a benediction and all the neighboring church bells rang, the students had ringed Lafayette Square and packed the sidewalks in front of the White House and the old rococo State Department building next door. It was the biggest peace demonstration Washington has ever seen, and the biggest demonstration of any kind here since Negro organizations held their famous Prayer Meeting some years ago before the Lincoln Memorial. Just as the Negroes had picked the symbolism of the Memorial in their prayer for a new liberation, so the students marched off at 12:30 to the tomb of the Unknown Soldier across the river; there high up above the city and the Potomac, without speeches or banners, they laid a wreath. In this silent pantomime was a plea no hateful propaganda could distort.

For the sophisticated observer, there had also been an unmistakable message in the bright young faces and the banners of the immense picket line. These were no longer the beatniks of the 50's nor the party-liners of the 40's. Both a new courage and a new maturity were visible. There was a fresh spontaneity in the hand-painted signs they carried. This was a Third Camp demonstration, aware of the dreadful similarity in the military logic and nation state lawlessness on both sides. One banner quoted Camus, "Neither Victims Nor Executioners" and another Thoreau, "Unjust Law Exists." The Leftist heretic and the New England anarchist were alike congenial to this new youth, searching for perspectives more human than any divisive ideology and expressing a secular conscience far different from the ersatz Godliness of the Pentagon. "Make the World Safe for Humanity" said one banner, and another "The Deeper the Shelter the Bigger the Bomb." A third protested "Man Isn't A Mole" and another, "I'd Rather BE." One said, "Soviet Students We Criticize Our Government. You Must Criticize Yours. Both Sides Are to Blame." Another suggested "Men Who Want to Be Soldiers—Why Not Astronauts?" Here their orbit crossed Col. Glenn's.

The young President, when he looked from the windows, must have been touched by the number of these youthful pickets who quoted his own words. One said, "Neither Dead Nor Slave But Alive and Free—JFK"; another, "Let's Call A Truce to Terror"; a third "Let Us Never Fear to Negotiate—JFK" but a fourth, the most numerous, was impatient. It

(*Continude on Page Four*)

Idiot Arithmetic

"While the majority of our people can be saved from all-out nuclear attack, we cannot hope to save most of our industry and possessions. Fortunately much of our industrial strength is in our know-how and our organization. Our gross national product, the value of all we produce, is more than $500 billion a year. But the total value of all our belongings is more than $1,500 billions. This means that our present industrial complex, if replaced, could reproduce all we have in about three years."

—Dr. Edward Teller, Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 17.

We hope Dr. Teller is a better physicist than he is an economist. The gross national product includes the total value of all services and consumption. Of this $500 billion, even in normal times, we manage to put barely $30 billion into net capital formation, i.e. the construction of new factories, tools, buildings, etc. Thus even "if replaced", as Dr. Teller says, without specifying just how such a miracle could occur, our present industrial capacity (assuming also no loss in labor force and skills) would take 50 years, not three, in which to reproduce itself. "Survivors of a nuclear attack," Dr. Teller says blithely, "working with dedication, could replace this industrial complex in five years." Dr. Teller's arithmetic makes nuclear war sound so exhilirating we can hardly wait.

***At press time there came word of an exchange of messages on peaceful cooperation in space between Khrushchev, who has already pointed out reassuringly that the vehicles which carried Gagarin and Titov could deposit nuclear bombs upon any point on earth, and Kennedy, who is racing so hard for peace that he had to increase the Eisenhower military budget by almost 25%.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Clark Urges Student Conference to Help Change Climate of Opinion

Disarmament Impeded By An Inert Public and A Cynical Congress

Some 360 students from 85 colleges, including schools as distant as McGill in Montreal, Carlton in Minnesota and Tougaloo in Mississippi, attended a First Intercollegiate Conference on Disarmament and Arms Control at Swarthmore the Feb. 16 week-end. The keynote speech, by Senator Joseph S. Clark (D. Pa.) was on the high level to be expected from this able Senator. From this speech we cull here 3 passages of special interest: in the box below, the disquiet stirred by reports that the U.S. is abandoning its never-strike-first position; in the box in the adjoining column, a glimpse of the growing impatience among liberals with the new Disarmament Agency, and in the passages which follow a picture of the Congressional and public attitudes which are obstacles to disarmament. The text can be obtained by writing Senator Clark, Washington 25, D.C.

The Soviets and Control

"Those who state repeatedly in the press and on the stump [Sen. Clark said] that the Soviets have never indicated agreement to submit to controls are either careless or ignorant of what the Soviets agreed to in the McCloy-Zorin Statement. Let me read part of the sixth point in that satement:

"'All disarmament measures should be implemented from beginning to end under such strict and effective control **as would provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations . . . To implement control over, and inspection of, disarmament, an International Disarmament Organization . . . shall be created within the framework of the United Nations . . .** This Organization and its inspectors **shall be assured** unrestricted access without veto **to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.'" [Emphasis in original.]**

"This agreement on principles, of course, is limited by the Russians to controls over the disarmament process, as opposed to control over remaining arms; an untenable limitation. . . . But people should not be permitted to state without challenge that the Soviets have never agreed in principle to accept any controls.

"Perhaps the most important aspect of the McCloy-Zorin Agreement is the official recognition by the Russians for the first time of the necessity for creation of strong international peace-keeping machinery. . . .

"The President is hampered in implementing his disarmament policy by an alarming political lag in the country as well as in Congress. Not more than a handful of my colleagues are fully familiar with the McCloy-Zorin Agreement and the President's Disarmament Plan. Hardly any of them take disarmament seriously. . . .

New Arms Agency Needs Pushing

Senator Clark's Swarthmore speech revealed that Senator Humphrey (D. Minn.), the Senate's foremost proponent of disarmament, "told a high officer in the new Disarmament Agency recently—'The honeymoon is over. You can expect the real friends of disarmament to start pushing you hard . . .' Such "pushing" was advocated by Clark. "Examine," he said, "the annual report of the Disarmament Agency, just published and see if you think its announced list of study projects is balanced or weighted unduly toward scientific, not political problems. Let the Agency know it has a constituency in the country at large; a constituency that backs it when it deserves help and pushes it when it fails to make progress."

"A Senate unwilling to give its advice and consent to repeal of the self-judging Connally Amendment; a Senate which finds controversial the obviously necessary step of helping the UN in its current fiscal crisis—such a Senate can hardly be expected to ratify a far-reaching disarmament treaty without an enormous amount of educational groundwork.

"In this regard, unhappily, the Congress appears to reflect sentiment throughout the country. Disarmament negotiation preparations and proposals have evoked scant and frequently inaccurate press attention. With rare exceptions, columnists, editorial writers, TV and radio news commentators are uninterested, or uninformed or both. Congressional mail on disarmament problems until the Berlin crisis last summer was almost nil. Since then it has picked up but, too frequently, reflects only an impatient desire for peace, not constructive suggestions for obtaining it. . . ."

(After suggesting formation of a permanent intercollegiate group on disarmament as a means of changing the climate of opinion Senator Clark warned) "Inside the Government of the United States, and I suspect, the Government of the Soviet Union as well, a contest is being waged for the minds of men in power. On one side of this contest, are the men who see no end to the arms race. They point to the history of power balance struggles and wars since nation states evolved and predict the future in like terms. . . . They think of disarmament purely as propaganda and cite the failure of past disarmament talks. They see no future for the United Nations. All too often they have a vested interest in a continuing arms race as members of the entrenched military-industrial complex. They have many strong allies in Congress."

Reported Adoption of 'First Strike' Strategy Questioned by Clark

"You probably know that the Administration has asked for more than $50 billion in defense appropriations in the coming fiscal year. Reports have been emanating from the Pentagon that defense expenditures will be in excess of $50 billion for each of the next five fiscal years.

"Defense-oriented columnists have reported a recent policy decision that we must further build up our nuclear deterrent so that it is more powerful than the Soviet nuclear striking force 'by a wide margin.' The decision is said to be based on the theory that a 'deterrent only capable of striking second is highly unlikely to deter adequately'; that we need to build a first strike force for possible use in 'desperate circumstances'; that its mere existence is the 'best insurance against accidents and miscalculations.'

"If this report is true and I have no inside information as to its accuracy, the consequences could be far-reaching indeed. Some of the questions which arise are: Is a conscious effort to achieve and maintain a 'first strike' nuclear force compatible with serious disarmament discussions? Can such a decision be put into effect without producing certain efforts to offset it by the Communist bloc and thus accentuating the arms race? Is it politically possible in the U.S. at present to make parity, not superiority, our defense objective?'

—Sen. Clark (D.Pa.) at Swarthmore conference, Feb. 16.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adlai's Words on Goa—The Evil of Resorting to Force—Quoted Back at Him

Our Cuban Policy Cuts A Poor Figure in Both the UN and NATO

The latest developments on Cuba might be summed up in this way: After many months of complaining about neutralism, we won a victory in the United Nations by begging the Asian-African neutrals to stay neutral and abstain from voting on either side in the Cuban-American quarrel. After many months of lecturing our European allies on the evils of imperialism, we sent Prof. Rostow to the NATO Council to ask for their support in our own quarrel with Cuba.

Too few Americans realize that our quarrel with Cuba is as much an imperial quarrel as was England's with Egypt. England tried to invade Egypt in anger over Nasser's seizure of the privately owned Suez canal, as we tried to invade Cuba in anger over Castro's seizure of Standard Oil and United Fruit properties.

NATO and Colonialism

When the North Atlantic Treaty was first before Congress, Mr. Acheson assured the country that we would not be bound by the treaty to fight the imperial quarrels of these allies in their Asian and African colonies. Now we are in the position of asking them to help us in our colonial quarrel with Cuba by imposing economic sanctions on Castro. Among these allies are Portugal, Belgium, France and England—all of them smarting from U.S. interference on the side of their own rebel colonials.

Nor is this the sum total of the wounds our Cuban policy has opened. Mr. Collet of Guinea during the debate on Cuba in the UN (Feb. 13)—pleading for peaceful negotiation between Washington and Havana—quoted back at Mr. Stevenson the words he had used in reprimanding India over Goa. "Whenever force is used to effect change," Mr. Collet quoted from Mr. Stevenson, "the very foundations of this peace-keeping organization, on which the security of all of us in whole or in part depends, are dangerously shaken."

The delegate of Guinea voiced another deeply felt grievance aroused by U.S. pressure on the Asian-African bloc in the Cuban affair when he spoke of "the contradictory attitude of those who openly ask for sanctions against Cuba, whereas, during all the discussions on colonial and racist problems, they categorically opposed sanctions—and these were justified sanctions—against the governments of South Africa, Belgium and Portugal, when these were cases of flagrant and repeated violations of the essential principles of the Charter on the part of these Governments."

It was by pressure on unhappy neutrals and smirking I-told-you-so allies that we managed to defeat the Czech-Romanian resolution on Cuba. The vote itself was instructive. Each paragraph was voted on separately. The first, expressing concern over the situation in the Caribbean, was defeated 50 to 11 with 39 abstentions; even Yugoslavia abstained. Even here only half those voting voted on our side. The second paragraph recalling that the UN was based on "friendly relations . . . self-determination . . . and non-interference" was actually adopted over our objections by 41 votes to none with 59 abstentions, the U.S. included.

The first operative paragraph asking the U.S. to cease interfering in Cuba was defeated by 50 votes to 11 with 39 abstentions, i.e. by half the countries participating. Under U.S. pressure even Yugoslavia did not join the Soviet bloc on this vote.

But on the second operative paragraph, the heart of the resolution, calling on the U.S. and Cuba "to settle their differences by peaceful means," we did not do as well. On this 28 neutrals joined the Soviet bloc. Among them were Yugoslavia, India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Morocco and both Congos. It was defeated 46 to 39 with 15 abstentions, i.e. by a minority of those participating. The only Asian powers voting with the U.S. on this were Malaya, Iran, Thailand and Nationalist China; the only African power was South Africa.

The lineup, the way it was achieved, and our unwillingness to accept even that part of the resolution which merely called for settlement by peaceful means, should make every honest and thoughtful American blush.

The Holy Wars Of Our Time

"The Conference of Punta del Este was greatly agitated by the difference between Cuba's ideological system and the one worshipped by the other States. I used the word 'worship' because, while in Man's march through history and his quest for basic creeds, our ancestors worshipped different Gods and were ready to kill each other for these differences, in our age of enlightenment we have made what is called scientific progress and now we worship different economic and political systems and are ready to kill each other for the differences between these systems.

"If the end aimed at is merely the exclusion of Cuba or any other member from a club of nations, we have no quarrel with that. As a non-aligned nation we should be the last to mourn the departure of a Member State from any military alliance . . . But if the end aimed at is sanctions—as some States have interpreted the issue—then . . . the decisions arrived at Punta del Este are . . . incompatible with the spirit of the Charter."

—Mr. Malalasakera, Ceylon, in the UN Feb. 14.

We Seem to Be Collaborating With Castro In Training Guerrilla Rebels

"The military training of Latin Americans in Cuba by the Castro regime and the wide distribution throughout the hemisphere of the treatise on guerrilla warfare by 'Che' Guevara, Castro's chief lieutenant, are clear evidence that the Castro regime is bent on guerrilla operations as another important device for gaining its objectives."

—Adlai Stevenson in the UN debate on Cuba, Feb. 14.

"The rebels [in Guatemala] . . . are led by former army officers who escaped to Honduras after an abortive uprising in November, 1960. They have thus named their present action the Nov. 13 Movement.

"The rebel officers and loyalist officers were all trained in the U.S. Guerrilla War Training School at Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone.

" 'One of our great difficulties,' President Ydigoras said, 'is that both sides have been trained in the same tactics by the same experts. Our commanders are very smart, but the rebels are very smart, too.' "

—"Guatemala's President Reports Crushing of Bananera Rebels", New York Times, Feb. 16.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from Page One*)

said "Mr. President, We Support The Peace Race. Let's Begin." The sober, admirably drafted policy statement circulated by the students was critical. It protested the "first strike" note creeping into the Administration's military planning It questioned the morality and the logic of renewed testing. It attacked the civil defense program, saying "By creating the illusion of public safety, civil defense encourages public support for the kind of 'hard' foreign policy being urged by extremists." It might have added, had it known, that the same hard policy was being urged that day in Chicago by Secretary McNamara.

Competent But Conventional

On Friday and Saturday, smaller contingents fanned out to lobby in the White House, on Capitol Hill, in the State Department and at the Soviet Embassy. These visits, like some unexpected difficulties, were an education. The White House was the one place where they found both sympathy and an ability to establish communication; the hot coffee the President sent out to the pickets was a gesture of friendliness, and there was respect in the high level of the advisers assigned to meet the student delegates: McGeorge Bundy, Jerome Wiesner, Ted Sorenson and Mark Raskin. The students felt understood; one Presidential adviser even suggested they should have picketed the Pentagon instead of the White House. What the students found less encouraging there was the concern with the easily possible, with making no move which was not sure of success in Congress; the caution, the conservatism. This combination of competence and conventionality is indeed the hallmark of the Kennedy Administration.

Elsewhere the students did not fare as well. At the Soviet Embassy they met affability but were unable to break through Soviet clichés. The State Department was worse; there they encountered "party line" without the affability. Some members of the delegation left in anger when they were treated to what they described as a series of pompous lectures on U.S. policy, and told they were hurting their country by not presenting a united front to the world! On Capitol Hill, except in the offices of such friendly members as Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon and Wm. Fitts Ryan of New York, the reception accorded the students was described as often rude. The worst was Chet Holifield of California, who sneered that someone had "filled the students full of baloney", an odd comment from a once liberal Congressman grown so inflated on Pentagon and AEC ozone as to be unrecognizable to his old friends.

The most disquieting revelation was how frightened non-official Washington still remains. All Souls Unitarian turned students away when they asked a place to sleep. Metropolitan A.M.E. wouldn't let them use its premises because they were to be addressed by Norman Thomas and many of its members were government employes afraid of so subversive an association. Even Union M.E. which allowed its use as headquarters forced the last contingent out onto the sidewalk in the cold night to wait for their buses. The National Press Club and both Howard University and George Washington refused to let them hold their final rally in their auditoriums—"too controversial." Norman Thomas—that evergreen of the peace movement—and Emil Mazey of the Auto Workers had to deliver the moving addresses with which the demonstration ended in the open and the cold near the Washington Monument.

Journalistic Footnote: British Guiana

Nicholas Kaldor, the famous Cambridge economist, who framed the budget which set off the riots in British Guiana, was interviewed by the London Sunday Times and the New York Times. The headline over the latter's story (Feb. 20) was, "Riots Are A Familiar Story to Tax Economist." The headline over the London paper's story (Feb. 18) was "Business Wrecking Jagan, Says the Budget Don." The New York Times reported that business men do not like Mr. Kaldor's tax plans for underdeveloped countries. The London Sunday Times explained that the device Mr. Kaldor recommends to these countries is calculated to prevent subsidiaries from operating at a paper loss while siphoning off profits to parent companies in tax haven countries. The new tax device imputes to the operating concern a share in the world-wide profits equal to the ratio between its turnover and the turnover of the world concern. The New York Times said Kaldor "charges industrialists inspired their workers to strike." The London Sunday Times reported, "The men behind the British Guiana crisis, he claims, are British, American and local business men who for years have been avoiding the 45 percent company profits tax." What was sharply presented in London was softened in New York.

Total Anti-Test Letters to President As Of Feb. 21 was 2,609 — Keep 'Em Coming

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/26/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Will Send Copies of This to Friends, If You Send Long Stamped Addressed Envelopes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED